

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-21 are pending herein, claims 1 and 12 being independent. By the amendment above, claim 10 has been amended to correct a typographical error in the dependency thereof, and claim 17 has been amended to delete a repeated word. No new matter has been added. It is noted that the Examiner examined claim 10 as though it depended from claim 1 (which is the way claim 10 was amended), and so the scope of claim 10 has not changed.

As noted, the Examiner objected to claim 1 as informal, due to a typographical error in its dependency. Claim 10 has been amended to rectify that typographical error, so that it now correctly depends from claim 1. Withdrawal of this objection is requested.

The Examiner went on to reject claims 1-17 and 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,170,060 (Mott, *et al.*), and claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Mott, *et al.*, in view of United States Patent No. 6,170,060 (Ballantyne, *et al.*). The applicant has carefully considered the Examiner's rejections, and the reasons given in support thereof, and respectfully submits that the claims present allowable subject matter in light of the art of record.

The invention is directed to a method (claim 1) and system (claim 12) for distributing digital information by registering a digital object which contains the digital information and an access device for receiving the digital object. A request that access to the digital object be granted to the access device is generated, and then the digital object is transmitted to the access device. The access device is then registered as having been granted access to the digital object, and further transmission of the digital object to any other access device is denied.

The inventive method and system are useful in enabling a content provider to control the use of disseminated digital information by a subscriber, and limit the use of disseminated digital

information to a single access device. The subscriber may use the distributed information (*e.g.*, music) on any one of a plurality of access devices (*e.g.*, personal music player, home audio system or car audio system), or even “lend” the distributed information to another person, while preventing the unauthorized duplication or dissemination of the digital information (claims 2 and 13). In this fashion, the distributor of the digital information may control the use of the distributed digital information while permitting the subscriber to use the information on different access devices. These access devices may also be of different types, with the digital information being distributed to each type of access device in a form specific to that access device (claim 3) or a content specific to that access device (claim 4).

According to the method of claim 5 and system of claim 14, each access device may be identified with a unique identifier, contained in a physical object (*e.g.*, a magnetic memory, a bar code, an optical memory or an RF tag -- claims 6 and 15). That physical object may be read to access the unique identifying code and access may be granted to the access device based on that code (claims 9 and 16). Access may even be granted to a non-registered access device by transferring the physical object to be read by that non-registered access device (claims 10 and 17), and then disabling access to the digital information to all registered access devices. This transfer may be managed by a controller and a manager for limiting access to the digital information in accordance with accepted protocols (claim 18).

The claimed method and system are distinct from the method and system taught in the applied references.

Mott, *et al.* teach a method and system for targeting a digital information playback device. Mott, *et al.* teach the distribution of digital information to subscribers to specific targeted devices, but do not teach the management of the digital information once distributed. Unlike the present

invention, which is concerned with what happens to the digital information once it is disseminated, Mott, *et al.* are concerned with the process of disseminating the digital information in the first place. Once that process is managed, Mott, *et al.* are not concerned with management of the use of that information by the end user. Mott, *et al.*, even describe their invention as being directed to “targeting a digital information playback device” (*see, e.g.*, col. 2, lines 10-11), and “for the secure transfer of digital information library programs (*see, e.g.*, col. 2, lines 63-65).

Thus, with this difference in focus, Mott, *et al.* fail to teach or suggest the claimed method steps of “registering said digital object as being in use by said access device” or “denying further transmission of said digital object to any other access device while said digital object is in use by said access device” (claim 1), or the claimed apparatus of “a controller for registering said digital object as being in use by said access device” and/or a “manager for denying further transmission of said digital object to any other access device while said digital object is in use by said access device” (claim 12).

Thus, the two independent claims being distinct from the only reference applied against them, all claims are allowable.

The dependent claims offer further bases for distinguishing the invention as claimed from the teachings of Mott, *et al.* Mott, *et al.* do not teach that access to the digital information may be granted to no more than one of a plurality of access devices at a time (claims 2 and 13). This would be unnecessary, as Mott, *et al.* are not concerned with managing the use of the digital information after it is distributed, as stated.

Mott, *et al.*, do not teach that the content of the digital information is distributed in a form specific to the type of access device (claim 4), for example where a user may choose to download a full movie to a home video system, but only an audio track to a personal music player.

The method and apparatus as claimed in claims 5 and 14 specify that each digital object has a unique identifying code, while Mott, *et al.*, teach the use of “device IDs” or “group “IDs” (col. 2, lines 9-19) which cannot identify the digital file since the device ID or the group ID may be given to more than one access device, and more than one ID may be given to a single access device (col. 18, lines 25-27).

Mott, *et al.* do not teach the disabling of access to any authorized user when the digital information is in use by a non-listed (but permitted) user (claims 10 and 17).

For all these reasons, therefore, the invention as claimed in claims 1-17 and 19-21 are neither taught nor suggested by Mott, *et al.* as applied by the Examiner. Withdrawal of this rejection is therefore respectfully solicited.


The addition of the Ballantyne, *et al.*, patent overcomes none of the shortcomings of the Mott, *et al.*, patent. Ballantyne, *et al.* teach method and apparatus for permitting only a single use of digital information (*e.g.*, a movie) by a recipient (col. 5, lines 32-35), and do not teach the features of the invention as described above. Thus, the invention as claimed is patentably distinct from Mott, *et al.*, in view of Ballantyne, *et al.*, as applied by the Examiner.

There being no further grounds for objection or rejection, it is respectfully submitted that the invention as claimed by the applicant herein is patentably distinct from the references applied by the examiner, either alone or in combination, and early and favorable action is therefore respectfully solicited.

It is believed that no fees or charges are required at this time in connection with the present application; however, if any fees or charges are required at this time, they may be charged to our Patent and Trademark Office Deposit Account No. 03-2412.

Respectfully submitted,

COHEN, PONTANI, LIEBERMAN & PAVANE

By 

Michael C. Stuart

Reg. No. 35,698

551 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1210

New York, New York 10176

(212) 687-2770

Dated: May 27, 2004